

**REMARKS****Claim Status**

Claims 1-3, 8, and 10-11 are pending after entry of this paper. Claims 1-3, 8, 10 and 11 have been rejected. Claims 4-7, 9, and 12 have been cancelled. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of cancelled claims in at least one divisional or continuing application.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the elements of previously presented claims 5 and 6. No new matter is added by the claim amendment. Support can be found throughout the application as filed, for example, in the last set of claims submitted December 19, 2008.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections in view of the claim amendment and remarks are respectfully requested.

**Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-3, 8 and 10-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Harvey et al (U.S. Reissued Patent No. 30,005). The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contentions.

However, in order to expedite prosecution without disclaimer of, or prejudice to, the subject matter recited in the instant application, applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of previously presented claims 5 and 6, and have cancelled previously presented claims 5 and 6.

The Examiner has indicated in the latest Office Action that claim 6 would be allowable if it was rewritten in independent form including all the elements of the base claim and any intervening claims (Office Action, page 4). Previously presented claim 6 depended from

claim 5, which in turn depended from claim 1. Therefore, applicants assert that instant claim 1 should be allowed because the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. Specifically, Harvey et al fails to teach and/or suggest an insulation portion surrounding a portion of the anode suspension rod that the device passes through.

Applicants further assert that claims 2-3, 8, and 10-11 are not anticipated by Harvey et al, because these claims depend from claim 1, which is not anticipated.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection to the claims in view of the above-mentioned claim amendments.

#### DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The applicant has not independently addressed all of the rejections of the dependent claims. The applicant submits that for at least similar reasons as to why independent claim 1 from which the dependent claims (i.e., claims 2-3, 8, and 10-11) depend are believed allowable as discussed *supra*, the dependent claims are also allowable. The applicant however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims and present independent bases for allowance for the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

Thus, applicant respectfully submits that the invention as recited in the claims as presented herein is allowable over the art of record, and respectfully requests that the respective rejections be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendment, election, and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Entry of the amendment and election is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate examination of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided. Favorable and timely action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. **504827**, Order No. 1004350.112US.

Respectfully submitted,  
Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell LLP

Dated: May 12, 2009

By:



Brandon T. Schurter  
Registration No. 59,668

Mailing Address:

Address Associated With Customer Number:  
**85775**

Telephone: (212) 415-8600  
Facsimile: (212) 303-2754